



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 10/734,602 | 12/12/2003 | Alex Lee | 105479-58453 (644-032) | 1632 |
| 26345 | 7590 | 08/04/2010 | | |
| GIBBONS P.C. | | | EXAMINER | |
| ONE GATEWAY CENTER | | | ABDIN, SHAHEDA A | |
| NEWARK, NJ 07102 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2629 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | |
| | | | 08/04/2010 | ELECTRONIC |
| | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPDocket@gibbonslaw.com

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/734,602 | Applicant(s) LEE ET AL. |
| | Examiner SHAHEDA A. ABDIN | Art Unit 2629 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2010.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 38-43,45-56 and 58-75 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 60-77 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 38-43,45-56,58 and 59 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 05/24/2010 has been entered and considered by Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 38, 41-43, 45, 48, 52, 56, 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beasley (US Patent No5721842).

(1) Regarding claim 38:

Beasley teaches a user terminal device (work station in Fig. 1) for producing an option menu (i.e. menu) (see the abstract), said device comprising :

A first set of on screen display circuits (e.g. circuit connected to numeric keys on key board 65 which is corresponding to produce images on display monitor 63), capable of producing a first video output for displaying on a video display (video output to the video monitor 63) (column 2, lines 60-67, column 3, lines 17-27)

a second set of on screen display circuits (e.g. mouse circuits corresponding to produce images on display monitor 63), capable of producing a second video output for displaying on the video display (i.e. displaying cursor on the monitor 63) (column 3, lines 1-27)

Beasley teaches a processor (e.g. 52) coupled to said first sets of image producing circuits and second sets of on screen display circuits, for configuring the video output (video signals) of each of said first sets and second sets of onscreen display circuits to generate (produce) an option menu on a video display (menus for the user on a video display, abstract) (column 3, lines 17-35),

Wherein the second set of on screen circuits (i.e. mouse circuits) are cursor image producing circuits for producing a cursor image (moving a cursor) within said option menu (column 12, lines 55-60).

(2) Regarding claim 41:

Beasley teaches the first set of on screen display circuits (key board 65) are capable (capable through video amplifier 92, see Fig. 2) of displaying a plurality of colors (i.e. video signals with red blue green) (column 4, lines 25-45).

(3) Regarding claim 42:

Beasley teaches said processor (i.e. 52) combines video output from at least two of the on screen display circuits (i.e. key board circuit) from the first set of on screen display circuits for displaying on said video display (i.e. video monitor 63) (column 3, lines 1-16).

(4) Regarding claim 43:

Beasley teaches wherein said device (user terminal) is disposed in a keyboard, video and cursor control device (KVM) (i.e. key board, video and mouse) switching system (column 3, lines 1-16).

(5) Regarding claim 45:

Beasley teaches the cursor within said option menu (i.e. user menu) is controlled via an attached keyboard and/or cursor control device (mouse) (column 12, lines 55-60).

(6) Regarding claim 48:

Beasley teaches wherein said device is implemented on a daughter board (i.e. 82, Fig. 2) to facilitate connection to a KVM (i.e. keyboard, video and mouse) switch system (column 3, lines 36-46).

(7) Regarding claim 52:

Beasley teaches said processor produces an option menu in digital video format (column 3, lines 37-46).

(8) Regarding claim 56:

Beasley teaches said option menu is displayed (produce in the monitor) in conjunction with an external video source (e.g. remote computer) (column 1, lines 63-67).

(9) Regarding claim 58:

Beasley teaches wherein said video output from the first set of on screen display circuits are combined such that each said video output (video on display) is displayed on a different section of said video display (i.e. different portion of the display monitor) (column 3, lines 28-35)

(10) Regarding claim 59:

Beasley teaches each of said first set of on screen display circuits (i.e. keyboard circuits) from the first set of image producing circuits is an on screen display circuit (note that the OSD source transmits keyboard command to the display, that means the OSD source produces one or more alphanumerical characters which is places on the video screen) (column 11, lines 60-67),

Note that Beasley teaches wherein the first set of on screen display circuits contains at least four on-screen display circuits (i.e. plurality of alpha numerical characters corresponding to onscreen display) and the second sets of on screen display circuits contains at least two on screen display circuits (i.e. mouse , and signal condition circuit 70) (column 3, lines 1-27, and column 11, lines 60-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley in view of Perholtz (US Pub No: 20020091850).

(1) Regarding claim 39:

Note that Beasley teaches the image producing circuits of the first set of image circuit are capable of producing video display, but Beasley does not teach the video display having a plurality of rows and columns of characters, and wherein each character comprises a plurality of pixels and the image producing circuits is capable of producing multiple background colors , multiple foreground colors.

However, Perholtz et al. in the same field of endeavor teaches the video display having a plurality of rows and columns of characters, each character comprises a plurality of pixels (i.e. the video display monitor 300 displays video signal in different section i.e. in different pixel position, see Fig. 4I-1, and 4I-2) and the image producing circuits (i.e. KVM switch circuit) is capable of producing multiple background colors , multiple foreground colors ([0202-0224], and claim 94 in the reference).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of a video display having a plurality of rows and columns of characters, each character comprises a plurality of pixels and the image producing circuit producing multiple background colors , multiple foreground colors as taught by Perholtz in to the display system of Beasley so that the video display could have a plurality of rows and columns of characters, and wherein each character could be comprised a plurality of pixels and the on screen display circuits could be capable of producing multiple background colors , multiple foreground colors. In this configuration the system would provide an unique color attribute in the display device (Perholtz, 0202-0203).

(2) Regarding claim 40:

Note that Brasley teaches the image producing circuits of the first sets and Perholtz teaches image producing circuit is capable of displaying characters in a plurality of fonts (i.e. characters) (see the illustration in Fig. 5g, and [0202]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a image producing circuits of the first sets have image producing circuit which could be capable of displaying characters in a plurality of fonts. Thus, the references meet the claim limitations as recited in the claim.

7. Claims 46 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley in view of Reinert et al. (US Patent No. 5821918).

(1) Regarding claim 46:

Note that Beasley teaches second set of on screen display circuits (i.e. mouse, cursor producing circuit) but Beasley does not teach that the second set of on screen display circuits (i.e. cursor producing circuit) comprise at least one outline generating circuit and cursor body generating circuit of the cursor.

However, Reinert in the same field of endeavor teaches a second set of image producing circuit (i.e. cursor producing circuit) comprise at least one outline generating circuit (i.e. processor 204 for cursor control device, Fig. 2), for producing an outline (202 cursor border r) of said cursor image and at least one circuit (221) for generating a body of said cursor image (column 6, lines 30-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate a cursor outline and body generating circuit as taught by Reinert in to the display system of Beasley so that a second set on screen display

circuit could be comprising at least one outline generating circuit for producing an outline of said cursor image and at least one circuit for generating a body of said cursor image . In this configuration the system would provide an improved user interface with appropriate cursor in the display device (Reinert, column 6, lines 41-53).

(2) Regarding claim 53:

Note that Beasley teaches that said processor (52) produces said option video format but Beasley does not teach a processor for producing analog video format.

However, Reinert in the same field of endeavor teaches a processor (i.e. 201 for DAC 20) for producing analog video format (column 4, lines 54-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of analog video format as taught by Reinart to the processor of Beasly so that the processor could be produced a video with analog video format.

8. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley in view of Asprey et al. (US Pub. 5257390, see IDS).

Regarding claim 47:

Note that Beasley does not teach a first clock for controlling a first timing of said plurality of on screen display circuits; and a second clock for controlling a second timing of said second set of on screen display circuits (plurality of cursor producing circuits).

However, Asprey in the same field of endeavor teaches a first clock (i.e. KBD CK) for controlling a first timing of said plurality of image producing circuits (i.e. key board); and a second clock (i.e. MSE CK) for controlling a second timing of said plurality of cursor producing circuits (i.e. mouse circuits) (see Fig. 2, and column 4, lines 1-40).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of first clock signal and second clock signal as taught by Asprey in to the display system of Beasley so that a first clock could be controlling a first timing of said plurality of on screen display circuits; and a second clock could be controlling a second timing of said second set of on screen display circuits. In this configuration the system will provide a high efficiency data transmission with reduced video noise and attenuation of the signal in the display device.

9. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley in view of Kitagawa et al. (US Patent No: 6768501 B2).

Regarding claim 49:

Note that Beasley does not teach the dimensions of the option menu are variable. However, Kitagawa in the same field of endeavor teaches an option menu with

variable dimensions (i. e. changeable dimension) (column 13, lines 34-41, column 15, lines 1-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of option menu with variable dimension as taught by Kitagawa in to the display system of Beasley so that option menu could have a variable dimension. In this configuration the system would provide an easy and quick data processing apparatus with arbitrary displayed portion for selecting an menu in the display device (Kitagawa column 2, lines 43-51).

10. Claims 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley in view of Vouri et al. (US Patent No: 5648795).

(1) Regarding claim 50:

Note Beasley does not teach that the option menu is displayed on the entire video display.

However, Vouri in the same field of endeavor teaches an option menu (i.e. option window) is displayed on the entire video display (see column 6, lines 127).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of option menu as taught by Vouri in to the display system of Beasley so that the option menu could be displayed on the entire video display. In this configuration the system would provide a easy and flexible data entry in the display device.

(2) Regarding claim 51:

Vouri teaches wherein color depth of said option menu can be changed using a keyboard or a cursor control device (column 5, lines 20-50, and column 6, lines 1 -25).

11. Claims 54-55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley in view of Antoun (US Pub. No. 20040131340).

Regarding claims 54 and 55:

Note Beasley does not disclose wherein the option menu is displayed on a 4:3 ratio video monitor (as recited in claim 54) and on a 16:9 ratio video monitor (as recited in claim 55).

However, Antoun in the same field of endeavor teaches the option menu is displayed on a 4:3 ratio video monitor and on a 16:9 ratio video monitor ([0064-0065]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of option menu display ratio as taught by Antoun in to the Display system of Beasley so that the option menu could be displayed on a 4:3 ratio video monitor (as recited in claim 54) and on a 16:9 ratio video monitor (as recited in claim 55). In this configuration the system would provide a high efficiency data transmission with appropriate video capture with high rated in the display device.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 38 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that "Beasley does not teach a device containing a first and second set of onscreen display circuits for producing video images on the same display. Applicant also argues that "Beasley does not teach a device containing more than a single OSD circuit image circuits that combined to form a single option menu on a single display.

In response, Examiner disagree Applicant's point of view. Note that the limitations "a first and second set of on screen display (OSD) circuits" are still very broad, as recited in claim 38". Beasly's reference teaches OSD programming circuit 99 which is associated with different display signaling circuits, such as circuit connected to numeric keys on key board 65 and mouse signal circuits, for display monitor 63 (column 2, lines 60-67, column 3, lines 17-27, Fig. 2). Therefore, Beasly's reference clearly teaches the claim limitations as recited in independent claim 38.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiry

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Shaheda Abdin** whose telephone number is (571) 270-1673.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard HJerpe** could be reached at (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pari-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Art Unit: 2629

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call
800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shaheda Abdin

07/21/2010

/Richard Hjerpe/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629
